

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Pursuant to the Office Action of November 28, 2007, Claims 52-54, 59-63, 68-71, 77-81, 87, 90, 93 and 96 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada et al. (US 6,486,890) in view of Nakamura et al. (US 5,734,914) and Nakai et al. (US 6,072,454).

Claims 58, 67, 75 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada et al. in view of Nakamura et al. and Nakai et al., and further in view of Watanabe (U.S. 6,098,055).

Claims 52-57, 59-66, 68-74, 76-84, 89, 90, 93 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso et al. (U.S. 6,069,648) in view of Harada et al., Nakai et al. and Nakamura et al.

Claims 58, 67, 75 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso et al. in view of Harada et al., Nakai et al., and Nakamura et al., and further in view of Watanabe.

Claims 86, 88, 89, 91, 92, 94, 95 and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso et al. in view of Harada et al., Nakai et al., and Nakamura et al., and further in view of Zavracky et al. (U.S. 2002/0158823).

Claims 98 and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada et al., Nakai et al., in view of Nakamura et al., Minami et al. (U.S. 6,967,632) and Yamazaki et al. (U.S. 5,893,730).

Claim 100 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada et al. in view of Nakamura et al., Minami et al., and further in view of Kim et al. (U.S. 6,265,833).

Claims 101 and 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lebby et al. (U.S. 6,158,884) in view of Nakamura et al., and Suso et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 102 is objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim (Claim 101) but is indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Amendment of the Claims

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, applicants are canceling Claims 52-100, 102, and 103. Claim 101 is being amended to include the limitations of Claim 102, and is thus allowable in view of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. New Claims 104-108 are being added, each of which is dependent from Claim 101. Thus each of Claims 104-108 is also believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, the new claims, or the extension of time, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: March 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen B. Heller/

Stephen B. Heller

Registration No. 30,181

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO

CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568